



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

HR

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: San Francisco

Date:

NOV 27 2000

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(i)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: [REDACTED]

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

Identifying data related to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Mary C. Mulrean

Mary C. Mulrean, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, San Francisco, California, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted and the order dismissing the appeal will be withdrawn.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation in June 1989. The applicant married a United States citizen in [REDACTED] and is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to remain in the United States and reside with her spouse.

The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. The Associate Commissioner affirmed that decision on appeal.

On motion, counsel submits the results of an interview of the applicant's husband [REDACTED] with a physician in which it is revealed that [REDACTED] five-year old daughter [REDACTED] who was born with severe brain damage, [REDACTED] in the early part of 2000 and that event causes him profound grief and affects him daily.

On motion, counsel submits an updated report on the health of the applicant's son [REDACTED] who underwent cardiac surgery shortly after his birth on [REDACTED]. The physician states that Christopher will probably require cardiac surgery in the future and is getting regular cardiac checkups.

On motion, counsel submits a copy of the applicant's complaint to the State of New York Bar Committee regarding the ineffectiveness of the applicant's prior counsel.

The record reflects that the applicant purchased a Philippine passport in another person's name containing a U.S. nonimmigrant visa and procured admission into the United States on June 26, 1989 as a nonimmigrant visitor by presenting that Philippine passport to an immigration officer.

Section 212(a) CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION.-Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are inadmissible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

(6) ILLEGAL ENTRANTS AND IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS.-

(C) MISREPRESENTATION.-

(i) IN GENERAL.-Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has

sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANT INADMISSIBLE FOR FRAUD OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION OF MATERIAL FACT.-

(1) The Attorney General may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a) (6) (C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

(2) No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action of the Attorney General regarding a waiver under paragraph (1).

Sections 212(a) (6) (C) and 212(i) of the Act were amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), Pub L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009. There is no longer any alternative provision for waiver of a § 212(a) (6) (C) (i) violation due to passage of time and children are no longer qualifying relatives. In the absence of explicit statutory direction, an applicant's eligibility is determined under the statute in effect at the time his or her application is finally considered. See Matter of Soriano, Interim Decision 3289 (BIA, A.G. 1996).

If an amendment makes the statute more restrictive after the application is filed, the eligibility is determined under the terms of the amendment. Conversely, if the amendment makes the statute more generous, the application must be considered by more generous terms. Matter of George and Lopez-Alvarez, 11 I&N Dec. 419 (BIA 1965); Matter of Leveque, 12 I&N Dec. 633 (BIA 1968).

After reviewing the amendments to the Act and to other statutes regarding fraud and misrepresentation from 1957 to the present time, and after noting the increased penalties Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar and eliminating children as a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship, it is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping fraud and misrepresentation related to immigration and other matters.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from § 212(a) (6) (C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Although extreme hardship is a requirement for § 212(i) relief, once established, it is but one

favorable discretionary factor to be considered. See Matter of Mendez, Interim Decision 3272 (BIA 1996).

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act include, but are not limited to, the following: the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and finally, significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, the Board also held that the underlying fraud or misrepresentation may be considered as an adverse factor in adjudicating a § 212(i) waiver application in the exercise of discretion. Matter of Tijam, Interim Decision 3372 (BIA 1998), followed. The Board declined to follow the policy set forth by the Commissioner in Matter of Alonso, 17 I&N Dec. 292 (Comm. 1979); Matter of Da Silva, 17 I&N Dec. 288 (Comm. 1979), and noted that the United States Supreme Court ruled in INS v. Yueh-Shaio Yang, 519 U.S. 26 (1996), that the Attorney General has the authority to consider any and all negative factors, including the respondent's initial fraud.

In Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the court stated that "extreme hardship" is hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship.

The court held in INS v. Jong Ha Wang, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

As previously stated, hardship to a child is not a consideration in § 212(i) proceedings. However, extreme hardship to a qualifying relative may be shown in specific and very narrow instances where a child's affliction or ailment is so serious or so grave as to require very precise care and treatment which would raise the level of financial and emotional hardship of the qualifying relative to the level of extreme.

After reviewing the most recent letter from christopher's attending physician and considering the severity of the child's affliction, the necessity for continual monitoring of the child, the probability of future surgery, and the emotional hardship Jacob has suffered due to the recent death of his daughter, it is concluded that the totality of the emotional hardship in conjunction with financial and other hardships to the qualifying relative in this matter rise to the level of extreme as envisioned by Congress.

The grant or denial of the above waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Attorney General and pursuant to such terms, conditions, and procedures as she may by regulations prescribe.

The favorable factors include the applicant's family ties, the absence of a criminal record, the numerous letters attesting to her helpfulness to others and the extreme hardship to the qualifying relative.

The unfavorable factors include the applicant's procuring admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation and her lengthy stay in the United States without Service authorization.

Although the applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned, it is concluded that the favorable factors in this matter now outweigh the unfavorable ones. In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. See Matter of T-S-Y-, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). Here, the applicant has now met that burden. Accordingly, the order dismissing the appeal will be withdrawn. The district director's decision will be withdrawn and the application will be approved.

ORDER: The order of July 5, 2000 dismissing the appeal is withdrawn. The district director's decision denying the application is withdrawn and the application is approved.